

REMARKS**Introductory Comments:**

Claims 1-28 are pending in the application. Claims 17-20 and 26-28 are allowed. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph; and claims 1, 15, 21, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Aga et al. (US2002/0087235 AI). Claims 2-14, 16, 22, and 23 are objected to for being dependent on a rejected base claim. Claims 1 and 21 are cancelled. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of claims 2-16 and 22-25.

In Response To The Claim Objections:

Claims 2-14, 16, 22, and 23 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The Applicants have amended claims 2 and 22 in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion. Claims 3-14 and 16 depend from the amended claim 2 and claim 23 depends from the Amended claim 22 and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the aforementioned reason.

In Response To The Claim Rejections:

Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1, 15, 21, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Aga et al. (US2002/0087235AI).

- 9 -

(10/620.881)

Regarding the 35 U.S.C. 112 rejection, the Applicants have removed the parenthetical information from the claim, which the Office Action found to render indefinite. Claim 25 is believed to be allowable for this reason and because claim 25 depends from the amended claim 22.

Regarding the 35 U.S.C. 102 rejections of claims 1, 15, 21, and 24, the Office Action alleges that Aga et al. teaches a method for detecting a roll rate sensor fault including generating a reference roll angle, generating a roll rate sensor signal, comparing the reference roll angle to the roll rate sensor signal, and generating a sensor fault signal in response to comparing the reference roll angle to the roll rate sensor signal (page 6, [0078]).

In response to the rejections, claims 1 and 21 have been cancelled and the limitations of claims 1 and 21 have been incorporated in the amended claims 2 and 22 respectively. Claims 2 and 21 are believed to be allowable for at least the reason. Claims 15 and 24 depend from the amended claims 2 and 22 respectively and are therefore believed to be allowable.

Conclusions:

In view of the aforementioned remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are in a condition for allowance. A notice of allowability is therefore respectfully solicited. Please charge any fees required in the filing of this amendment to Deposit Account 50-0476.

Should the Examiner have any further questions or comments please contact the undersigned. Please charge any fees required in the filing of this amendment to deposit account 06-1510.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Justin H. Purcell
Reg. No. 53,493
28333 Telegraph Road
Suite 250
Southfield, MI 48034
(248) 223-9500

Dated: January 25, 2005